- 5 -

## REMARKS

The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on November 14, 2007. Claims 17-22 and 31-36 are pending in the application.

## Rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 32 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

### Examiner's rejection

The recitation of claim 32 is vague and indefinite because when taking the combination of claims 31 and 32 together, it is unclear of how the limitation of "except for ... data packet" recited in claim 31, lines 5-7 is to be carried out since there is now only one bad control word to determine becoming unsynchronized. That is, how the synchronized data packet can separate one bad control word? Similar problem exists for the recitation of claim 35.

### Applicant's response

Applicant directs the Examiner's attention to applicant's specification beginning on page 12, line 6 to page 13, line 7. This portion clearly teaches the embodiment including; "This principle can be generalized, for example, by counting the number of received bad control words is up to some threshold before transitioning from the synch state to the no_synch state. In this way, the invention allows for a faster recovery from transient data errors at the expense of a reduced sensitivity to a loss of synchronization.

Using control words to confirm synchronization according to the present invention is consistent with their functional use in data transmission. In the preferred embodiment, suitable control words defined by identical control characters across each serial line are

- 6 -

used as framing indicators, including (from Table 3): SOP (start of packet), EOP (end of packet), and ESOP (end and start of packet). These allow confirmation of link synchronization at the start and end of every packet received. The control characters used in these control words are not used for any other purpose, so these control words also enable the detection of a loss of synchronization."

Applicant believes the specification is enabling and supports the limitation of claims 32 and 35.


## Merit rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)

Claims 17-22 and 31-36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Hashemi et al. (US 6,064,679) hereinafter Hashemi.


### Examiner's rejection

Regarding claims 17-22, Hashemi, as shown in figure 3, teaches a method for word synchronization between the plurality of word devices (300) connected by serial lines (310) comprising requesting synchronization when the word device (300) is inserted into the hub loop and performing the synchronization process so that the newly connected word device (300) can communicate with other word devices (300) in the hub loop. See also column 5, line 25 to column 7, line 7.

Regarding claims 31-36, Hashemi also teaches detecting loss of word synchronization whenever there are a number of bad control words being received. See column 7, lines 7-14.


### Applicant's response

Applicant presents claim 17 below:

17. (Previously presented) A method for word synchronization between a plurality of word devices connected by a plurality of serial lines, comprising the steps of:

requesting synchronization from a first device to a second device when the first device does not have synchronization;

- 7 -

receiving a request for synchronization at a first device from a second device, the first device then becoming synchronized;

transmitting data from a first device to a second device, the first device being synchronized, the first device having received from the second device a synchronization signal indicating that the second device is synchronized.

It is clear to applicant that the Examiner is not understanding or giving patentable weight to the clear limitations in applicant's claims. In the above rejection the Examiner made absolutely no effort to show where in the art applicant's claimed elements and functionality are shown. The teaching of Hashemi provided by the Examiner above has absolutely no relation to applicant's claims. What part of Hashemi does the Examiner relate to the claimed first device? What part of Hashemi does the Examiner relate to the claimed second device?

The Examiner's broad recitation of what Hashemi teaches and providing three columns of Hashemi's specification is grossly insufficient to prove a valid prima facie case of anticipation. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner give due diligence to this matter and adequately point out in the art where applicant's claimed subject matter is taught.

Applicant argues that Hashemi fails to teach synchronization between a first device and a second device, as claimed. Hashemi teaches that a hub port of the preferred embodiment provides a clock local to the hub. The local clock reduces and preferably eliminates the transfer of jitter in the signal transmitted to a node port. Hashemi accomplishes this by providing a hub port including smoothing circuits to synchronize data received from the attached node port to a local clock that is internal to the hub and common to all hub ports in the hub. Jitter transfer is preferably eliminated by transmitting data to an attached node port using an internal clock of the hub rather than a clock signal recovered from the data stream. An additional advantage provided by the synchronization of data from a node port to a local clock is that a constant phase is maintained in the data stream of the hub.

- 8 -

Applicant fails to see how the art of Hashemi and applicant's invention are related without adequate explanation from the Examiner. Applicant believes independent claims 17 and 31 are easily patentable over the art and statements provided by the Examiner. Claims 18-22 and 32-36 are patentable on their own merits, or at least as depended from a patentable claim.

Applicant points out that this is the fifth action where the Examiner asserts art which continually fails in a consistent manner. Obviously, there is no prior art available as evidenced by the Examiner's continuous attempts. It is therefore respectfully requested that this application be reconsidered and that this case be passed quickly to issue. If there are any time extensions needed beyond any extension specifically requested with this amendment, such extension of time is hereby requested. If there are any fees due beyond any fees paid with this amendment, authorization is given to deduct such fees from deposit account 50-0534.

Respectfully submitted
Angshuman Saha et al.

By /Donald R. Boys/
Donald R. Boys
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency, Inc.
3 Hangar Way, Suite D
Watsonville, CA 95076
831-768-1755